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Studies have shown that academic cheating is a pervasive, global problem occurring consistently throughout high school, college, and graduate studies across the world (Whitley, Nelson, & Jones, 1999). Despite a variety of attempts to understand root causes and to help curb cheating, it remains a very real element in the academic career of many students; anywhere from fifty to eighty percent of college students admit to taking part in some form of cheating during their college careers, although the numbers varying greatly between countries (Rawwas, Al-Khatib, & Vitell, 2004). It is an alarming statistic.

Major concerns over cheating can typically be placed within two main categories: the direct impact of an individual cheating on his or her own life and career, and the impact that a culture of cheating can have on an institution or within a discipline. From the individual’s perspective, the value of an individual’s own education is significantly cheapened when it is possible for one to cheat to obtain accreditation (Zobel, 2014). In addition, some have theorized that behavioral patterns of cheating, when unchallenged, can make academic dishonesty a consistently more viable option for students in their education, further reinforcing the behavior (Rawass et al., 2004). From the institutional perspective, the credibility of an academic program or field inevitably suffers if it is perceived to be lax in its response to these or other instances of cheating. As Zobel (2004) points out, regardless of how prevalent (or rare) cheating actually is, the estimation of an institution can be easily marred by a public perception of cheating being the (unchallenged) norm. For these reasons, researchers and administrators alike have strived to find more effective ways to recognize, neutralize, and discourage cheating.
Personal versus Institutional Effects of Cheating

A great deal of research has been conducted in an attempt to find factors that may help to predict academically dishonest behavior. Some findings are fairly generalizable over a variety of circumstances. For example, men are typically more likely to cheat in academics in college or university compared to women (Lin & Wen, 2007). Older students are less likely to cheat than younger students within a college environment (Lin & Wen, 2007). Other factors have been connected more consistently to cultural differences, such as Rawwas et al.’s work (2004) showing that differences in cultural groups’ moral beliefs correlate with certain beliefs and behaviors related to cheating. Furthermore, individual differences in students who cheat can make responding to academic dishonesty more difficult than applying blanket policies or vague codes—a student copying a peer’s answers to pass a test presents different challenges from one who purchases essays in an effort to be at the head of the class.

Cultural differences in cheating beliefs and behaviors

Research on academic dishonesty has moved beyond simply surveying the prevalence of cheating in various organizations and across various cultures. Cheating research presents unique challenges, particularly in cross-cultural research, in part due to inconsistent definitions of types of cheating (plagiarism, collusion, etc.), as well as which types of behaviors are indeed considered cheating. Kwong et al. (2010) presented a particularly novel example: many Hong Kong students’ have a lack of familiarity with the Western definition of plagiarism. Thus, discovering both the pervasiveness and gauging perception of an unethical behavior can be incredibly challenging when it is not necessarily considered unethical by your sample. Even within the same US state it is not uncommon for American universities to have their own differing definitions of academic dishonesty. Efforts have been made by researchers to more
specifically define and develop reliable measures for these concepts, placing more emphasis on actions as well as methods in collecting data (Ercegovac & Richardson 2004). However, with the presence of such large differences, simple operational definitions may prove useless without a substantial amount of flexibility in the definitions of these constructs. Even within cultural groups, different social groups (such as faculty and students) have shown great variance in the perception of what constitutes academic dishonesty (Kwong, Ng, Mark, & Wong, 2010).

**Students studying internationally**

As described by Ercegovac and Richardson (2004), in order for research to be conducted and put to practical use, researchers must investigate behaviors, correlations, and perceptions holistically; viewing these points in a cross-cultural setting offers especially exciting opportunities. Behaviors have been compared and contrasted between cultures, often with emphasis on the characteristics common to each country’s local culture (Rawwas et al. 2004). However, there is little research thus far on students studying in foreign universities where their cultural beliefs may be incongruent with local or host cultures. Individual assignment grades and course grades often have high stakes for these students given the importance of their academic success in determining their ability to remain in their host country (Kwong et al., 2010).

Academic concerns and the possible cultural incongruence is a combination that could have very serious implications for these students and their host schools, and is worthy of investigation. Research is also necessary to better understand settings and situations with specific challenges related to cheating, such as digital classrooms, multi-lingual classroom environments, and home school (Stuber-McEwen, Wiseley, & Hoggatt, 2009).

It is worth noting that although certain cultural groups tend to have stronger opinions of certain cheating behaviors (Kwong et al., 2010), this does not necessarily suggest that these
behaviors as exclusive or even more common to these cultures. As noted by Yardley, Rodríguez, Bates, and Nelson (2009), cheating “to help a friend” was among the most prominent reasons given when alumni were asked about reasons for committing academically dishonest acts. This is an important reminder that cultures may have differences in beliefs towards and participation in academic cheating, but in many ways have much more in common.

**Types of cheating**

Kwong, et al. (2010) suggest that cheating behaviors can be generally categorized into the four categories of plagiarism (the taking of credit for the work or ideas of another), collusion (coordinated efforts by a group for purposes of cheating), fabrication of data (artificially manufacturing data and representing it as genuine), and copyright infringement (utilizing or duplicating materials without permission or compensation). While each category of cheating has been addressed to some degree in the literature, plagiarism is often the sole type of cheating considered in studies and is likely the most widely studied form of cheating (Lin & Wen, 2007). Despite plagiarism being well researched, it is also a problematic construct to consistently define across cultures and within communities (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004). While research in this area has proved fruitful, plagiarism has not been shown to effectively predict other cheating behaviors, save some modest correlations (Rawass et al., 2004). Additionally, research on plagiarism (as well as the majority of studied cheating behaviors) has largely been limited to survey and self-report studies. Whitley and colleagues (1999) argue that given the sensitive nature of the topic, it would be prudent to study more experimental approaches, though this admittedly brings about further potential difficulties and ethical questions. Finally, the sensitive nature of the cheating makes it difficult to effectively research the success rate of cheating.
control (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004), given the low levels of incentive and potentially high level of risk for a student to admit to having cheated in the classroom.

**Attempting to teach definitions of academic dishonesty**

Given the potential prevalence of academic dishonesty, as well as the difficulty and effort required to both recognize and address academic dishonesty, it makes sense that different school systems and educational organizations have attempted a variety of methods to help curb cheating behaviors from occurring at all: Postle (2009) discusses such an example in which educators are trained in seminars on the types and reasons for plagiarism among students studying social work. The goal of that conference is to have better trained educators who can then better educate students on the defining characteristics of plagiarism as well as its potential impact on their work, their career, and the field in general.

At Marietta College, one of these attempts at training is the First Year Experience (FYE) program. The program aims to educate newly entering students on certain norms and expectations on the Marietta campus as well as higher education in general (A. Doerflinger, personal communication, January 8, 2015). The program is aimed at helping students become acclimated to life and norms of student life at Marietta College. As a part of this process, incoming students are educated on what is defined as academic dishonesty, as well as school expectations and the potential consequences of cheating. Similar efforts have been made by many institutions, often demonstrating encouraging results, such as those shared by Marshall, Taylor, Hothersall, and Pérez-Martín (2011). It was demonstrated in that study that an educational seminar for postgraduate students on plagiarism (as well as the faculty’s tools to recognize it) helped decrease the instances of plagiarism. Similar to the Marshal et al. (2011) study, the goal of the FYE program is to inform students of the consequences of cheating
behaviors; to recognize what is and is not considered cheating; and to highlight the potential differences in expectations (and consequences) at Marietta College compared to previous experiences.

**Basis for present research**

The collective body of literature pertaining to academic dishonesty is substantial, but still has a great number of questions requiring further investigation. In the spectrum of cross-cultural dynamics of cheating, the unique challenges it presents also bring about questions and answers that can offer great insight into cultural, academic, and ethical dynamics. Students from The People’s Republic of China, Kuwait, and other countries are well represented at Marietta College, which provided prime opportunity to investigate how students from traditionally collectivist cultures may perceive cheating behaviors differently from their peers hailing from more individualistic cultures. Previous research has helped to establish that Kuwaiti culture tends to be, like its neighboring nations, more collectivist in nature (Ali, Taqi, & Krishnan, 1997). Thus, for the purposes of this study, this population provided a participant sample whose home culture can be described as collectivist, but these students currently attend an American College with an individualist culture. Additionally, research has demonstrated that cheating is a real issue in Kuwait and surrounding Arab nations, much like many other places in the world. (Shehnaz & Sreedharan, 2011). This study offered the unique opportunity to utilize Kuwaiti students as well as American students in studying perceptions of academic dishonesty from a specifically cross-cultural perspective, while likewise exploring how norms of collectivism and individualism may impact these perceptions.
The Current Study

The current study aimed to investigate the differences between Marietta College international student population (particularly those from collectivist cultures of Kuwait and China) and domestic students regarding their perception of individuals who take part in academic cheating, and if these views change after the FYE program (or equivalent training) at Marietta College. The study was a cross-sectional, 2 (Culture group) X 2 (Year in school) experimental design comparing students from two cultures with students grouped according to the dominant norms of their home nations (collectivist and individualistic) and year in school (freshmen students and upperclassmen).

Hypotheses

I hypothesized that students from dominantly collectivist nations, Kuwait and People’s Republic of China (PRC) will rate plagiarism and collusion as significantly less negative than students from the dominantly individualistic nations (USA, UK). Ratings of fabrication of data were expected to not be significantly different between the two groups. It was also hypothesized that statistically significant relationships between collectivism and individualism scores and cheating perception scores will be illuminated.

I predicted that the effective discrimination between cheating and non-cheating behaviors would be greater in upperclassmen compared to first year students, and that upperclassmen would rate cheating behaviors more negatively.

Given Marietta College’s efforts to educate students on the definitions, ethics, and consequences of cheating, this study can be helpful in both understanding the social perceptions of others involved in cheating, potential cultural differences driving those perceptions, and
helping to understand if training by the college is has the desired impact on perceptions of academic dishonesty.

The hypotheses were thus defined: first, students from predominantly collectivist nations will rate plagiarism as less negative than students from individualist nations; second, students from predominantly collectivist nations will rate collusion as less negative than students from individualist nations; third, ratings of fabrication of data will not be significantly different between culture groups; fourth, students in later class years will more effectively discriminate between cheating and non-cheating behaviors; and fifth, students in later class years will rate cheating behaviors more negatively.

Methods

Participants

Eighty-three student participants were recruited from the general student population of Marietta College. Recruitment was done through visiting courses (as approved by instructors), the Marietta College SONA System, and through on campus flyers with a link to the study and a QR (quick response) code for easy access to the survey via a smartphone. A raffle was held for participants as incentive with three twenty dollar gift cards to Starbucks Coffee; the raffle was based on participation, not on quality or content of responses. Additionally, campus instructors were asked to consider offering extra credit for participation in the study, which some chose to do. The test took approximately fifteen minutes, and was accessible on a smart phone or computer.

Participant confidentiality was protected with password protection on all recorded data. Additionally, participant’s names were not connected directly to the data. Collected student’s
names were only collected for purposes of granting credit (where appropriate) and contacting winners of the raffle.

Within the participant pool, Students under the age of eighteen were not be eligible for participation in this study. Informed consent was obtained prior to test.

**Materials and Procedures**

Students were administered surveys using Qualtrics survey software. First, participants completed a demographic form; this set of demographic questions pertained to age, previous school experience, nationality, and previous international experiences. Then participants took the Auckland Individualism and Collectivism Scale developed by Shulruf, Hattie, and Dixon (2007) assessing levels of reported collectivism and individualism subscales (collectivism: advice, harmony; individualism: competition, uniqueness, responsibility) (see Appendix A). For the purposes of this study, the scale was compiled into composite individualism and collectivism scores to effectively match the two culture groups in the study. Participants were then exposed to a series of fifteen brief text and picture vignettes illustrating various types of cheating behavior (or non-cheating behavior) (see Appendix C) and were accompanied by an associated set of questions (Appendix B) which were combined to obtain a Cheating Perceptions Composite Score (CPCS). The three domains of cheating identified by Kwong et al. (2010): plagiarism, collusion, and fabrication of data (omitting copyright infringement) were represented in the vignettes (five within each domain). Twelve vignettes demonstrated a student participating in some form of academic dishonesty; three of the vignettes (one from each domain) demonstrated an action that was in fact not academically dishonest.
Results

The total recruitment sample, over approximately three months of collection, was $N = 83$; $n = 52$ participants of the sample reported being in their first year at Marietta College, with $n = 30$ being in their second year or later; $n = 61$ participants reported as coming from nations having generally individualist cultures (USA, UK), and $n = 21$ coming from generally collectivist nations (Kuwait and PRC). One participant was removed from the analysis because the participant did not complete the survey (see Table 1).

Multifactor Analyses of Covariance (MANCOVA)

A multifactor analysis of covariance was conducted to assess if there was a significant difference between student perspectives on cheating behaviors between first year and upperclassmen students and students from collectivist and individualist culture groups. The Auckland Collectivism Scale score was utilized as a covariate.

Only one of the given hypotheses was supported by the analysis of the data. Ratings of fabrication of data were not significantly different between cultural groups on the CPCS, $F(3,78) = 3.12, p = .08$ (see Table 4 and Figure 3). Participants from the collectivist culture group did not rate plagiarism as significantly less negative, $F(3,78) = 1.05, p = .31$ (see Table 2 and Figure 1). Participants from the collectivist culture group did not rate collusion as significantly less negative, $F(3,78) = 1.70, p = .20$ (see Table 3 and Figure 2). Participants from the two class year groups did not show a significant difference in discriminating between cheating and non-cheating behaviors, $F(3,78) = 2.19, p = .64$ (see Table 5 and Figure 4).

Correlations in perceptions of cheating individuals

There were significant negative correlations between the total Auckland Scale score of individualism and ratings of collusion, $r(81) = -.28, p = .01$ (see Figure 6), and ratings of
fabrication of data, \( r (81) = -0.41, p < 0.001 \) (Figure 6). There was a significant positive correlation between the total Auckland Scale score of individualism and ratings of non-cheating behaviors, \( r (81) = 0.37, p = 0.001 \) (Figure 9). There were significant positive correlations between ratings of plagiarism and ratings of collusion, \( r (81) = -0.79, p < 0.001 \) (see Figure 8), and ratings of fabrication of data, \( r (81) = -0.78, p < 0.001 \) (Figure 9). There was a significant positive correlation between ratings of fabrication of data and ratings collusion, \( r (81) = -0.79, p < 0.001 \) (see Figure 10). There was a significant negative two-way correlation between ratings of fabrication of data and perceptions of non-cheating behaviors, \( r (81) = -0.34, p = 0.002 \) (see Figure 11).

**Discussion**

The results of the given survey did not support the majority of the research hypotheses, but did yield findings that may prove useful in helping to interpret previous research and offer potential areas worthy of further study. Contrary to my hypothesis, students’ cultural origin and year of college did not have any significant impact on perceptions of academically dishonest activity. I hypothesized that plagiarism and collusion would be viewed less negatively by students from collectivist nations with no significant differences in fabrication of data; only the perceptions of fabrication of data were shown to be in line with the original hypothesis. Additionally, the hypotheses related to student year were not supported: students in later years of college were not shown to be more effective at discriminating between cheating and non-cheating behaviors; and first year students did not rate cheating behaviors less negatively than students in later class years.

This absence of significant differences between the two major culture groups suggests three particular possibilities: first, that the first year programs at Marietta College designed to acclimate international students to standards of academic integrity are doing so, effectively
rendering potential cultural differences less severe than hypothesized. Two, the reported
perceptions of cheating behaviors are qualitatively different from the reported or hypothetical
action if in relation to the participant instead of the individual in the vignette, meaning the
differences found in previous research may be indicative of students’ perceptions of cheating
behaviors when the student is participating in it; or three; the methods used in this study are
ineffective in discovering differences that may be present.

The absence of significant differences in class year groups also presents interesting
possibilities. Most specifically, with no significant differences seen between first year and later-
year students, it is reasonable to question if it is FYE training that mitigates the cultural
differences demonstrated in previous research, or if it is some other factor or collection of factors
not accounted for within this study. Additionally, it remains a possibility that differences
between these groups, and were simply not effectively measured by the given survey.

The analysis of data did, however, offer insight on a number of norms and trends in
perceptions of academically dishonest activities. The correlations discovered in the exploratory
analysis of the data showed a number of significant correlations between cheating perceptions
and the quality of individualism (on the Auckland Scale). Higher individualism scores were
correlated with more negative perceptions of collusion (see Figure 6) and the fabrication of data
(see Figure 7), while also correlated with more positive perceptions of non-cheating behaviors
(see Figure 8). While the MANCOVA did not find significant differences between the given
culture groups, these correlations suggest that there is still a tangible impact of cultural
backgrounds on perceptions of cheating behaviors. This is in line with previous research (i.e.,
Rawwas et al., 2004) but also suggests that cultural groups or nations of origin may not be an
entirely effective method of interpreting differences in perceptions of academic dishonesty.
Also interesting are the positive correlations between each of the three cheating domains (plagiarism, collusion, and fabrication of data). Between each of the three domains there are significant correlations related to the other two (see Figures 9, 10, and 11). With each of these three domains sharing a pattern in ratings, it suggests that regardless of domain, activities under the umbrella of cheating are seen universally as cheating. This raises questions as to the generalizability of findings on type of cheating on other forms of cheating; if so, a great deal of research previously thought to be domain or context specific may be useful in a much larger context of academic dishonesty research.

**Weaknesses and limitations**

There are a number of potential weaknesses and limitations in the present study. Specifically, though Marietta College does offer a modest student population with an unusually large portion of international students for its size, recruitment for individualists from traditionally collectivist nations proved challenging, as was recruiting students in their second year of college and beyond.

Additionally, the vast majority of students from a collectivist nation are from Kuwait, a nation that it is typically perceived as a collectivist nation, but is likewise home to a number of geographical pockets with cultural norms that may have rendered results less generalizable to the nation’s general population, or collectivist cultural groups, at large.

Beyond sampling errors, the study also likely suffered from oversights on the part of the researcher. First, that lack of demographic questions related to sex or gender, which has been demonstrated as a significant factor in previous research (Lin & Wen, 2007), and may have provided further insight in this study. In addition, the study piloted a novel survey and measurement scale in the CPCS. While this scale was based on previous research methods and
findings, it may nonetheless have been ineffective in measuring its intended target perceptions. The composite nature of the CPCS may have also proved limiting, potentially losing insight from responses were they scored individually.

Face validity may have been problematic as well; due to the nature of the Auckland Scale’s clear relation to cultural beliefs, the connection could have been made between culture groups and cheating perceptions by participants which may have affected given responses. Finally, the surveys were originally intended to be distributed at the beginning of the academic year so that first years students would be taking the survey prior to activity in the FYE program; due to logistical challenges, however, the survey was not distributed until later the in the semester, meaning responses of first year students may have been impacted by the FYE program. Students were not asked if they had taken part in the FYE program so it is also possible that some students had not participated in the program, which may be a substantial confound.

**Future research**

As research continues in the field of cross cultural perceptions of academic dishonesty and possible differences between cultures, a more varied sample from both collectivist and individualist nations would be well warranted to help establish if it is the unique qualities of specific nations, or the more generalizable norms of individualism and collectivism having effects on the perceptions here investigated. Future research may also be better served by proactively searching and selecting participant samples to ensure that the necessary populations are large and heterogenous enough to be able to effectively utilize this experiment’s model. Additionally, a regression model utilizing individual collectivism and individualism may prove more effective in exploring perceptions than distinct groups such as the culture groups utilized in this study.
Though here demonstrated with limited success, the exploration of academically dishonest behaviors beyond plagiarism continues to be an important direction for future research. While the given findings demonstrated no significant differences in the perceptions of the different types of cheating, the explored correlations do suggest differences in the varying domains interactions with factors of individualism and collectivism.
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Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>Collectivist Group</th>
<th>Individualist Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Classes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Means of Cheating Perceptions Composite Score (CPCS) for Plagiarism*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>Collectivist Group</th>
<th>Individualist Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td>28.83</td>
<td>29.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Classes</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>29.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>29.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Means of Cheating Perceptions Composite Score (CPCS) for Collusion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>Collectivist Group</th>
<th>Individualist Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>31.06</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>30.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Classes</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td>31.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32.38</td>
<td>30.40</td>
<td>30.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Means of Cheating Perceptions Composite Score (CPCS) for Fabrication of Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>Collectivist Group</th>
<th>Individualist Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>34.71</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>32.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Classes</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>30.18</td>
<td>31.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35.52</td>
<td>31.29</td>
<td>32.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

**Non-cheating Behavior Severity Rating Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>Collectivist Group</th>
<th>Individualist Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Classes</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1

Means of Cheating Perceptions Composite Score (CPCS) for Plagiarism

![Graph showing means of cheating perceptions composite score (CPCS) for plagiarism across collectivist and individualist cultures, as well as first and second year plus categories.](image)

**Figure 1.** Participants from the collectivist culture group did not rate plagiarism as significantly less negative, $F(3, 78) = 1.05, p = .31$. 
Figure 2

Means of Cheating Perceptions Composite Score (CPCS) for Collusion

Figure 2. Participants from the collectivist culture group did not rate collusion as significantly less negative, $F (3,78) = 1.70, p = .20$. 
Figure 3

Means of Cheating Perceptions Composite Score (CPCS) for Fabrication of Data

![Bar chart showing means of cheating perceptions composite score (CPCS) for fabrication of data. The chart compares Collectivist, Individualist, and Total groups across First Year and Second Year Plus categories.]

Figure 3. Ratings of fabrication of data were not significantly different between cultural groups, $F(3, 78) = 3.12, p = .08$. 
Figure 4

Means of Severity Ratings for Non-Cheating Behaviors

Figure 4. Participants from the two class year groups did not show a significant difference in discriminating between cheating and non-cheating behaviors, $F(3,78) = 2.19$, $p = 64$. 
Figure 5

*Correlation of Individualism Total Scores and Collusion CPCS*

*Figure 5.* There were significant negative correlation between the total Auckland Scale score of individualism and ratings of collusion, $r(81) = -.28$, $p = .01$. 
Figure 6

Correlation of Individualism Total Scores and Fabrication of Data Perception CPCS

Figure 6. There were significant negative correlation between the total Auckland Scale score of individualism and ratings fabrication of data, $r(81) = -.41, p < .001$. 
Figure 7

*Correlation of Individualism Total Scores and Severity Ratings of Non-cheating Behaviors*

*Figure 7.* There was a significant positive correlation between the total Auckland Scale score of individualism and ratings of non-cheating behaviors, $r (81) = .37, p = .001$. 
Figure 8

Correlation of Plagiarism Perception Scores and Collusion CPCS

Figure 8. There were significant positive correlation between ratings of plagiarism and ratings of collusion, $r(81) = .79, p < .001.$
Correlation of Plagiarism CPCS and Fabrication of Data CPCS

Figure 9. There were significant two-way positive correlation between ratings of plagiarism and ratings of fabrication of data, $r(81) = .78, p < .001$. 

![Correlation graph](image-url)
Figure 10

*Correlation of Fabrication of Data CPCS and Collusion CPCS*

*Figure 10.* There was a significant positive two-way correlation between ratings of fabrication of data and ratings of collusion, $r(81) = .79$, $p < .001$. 
Figure 11

Correlation of Fabrication of Data CPCS and Severity Ratings of Non-cheating Behaviors

Figure 11. There was a significant negative two-way correlation between ratings of fabrication of data and perceptions of non-cheating behaviors, $r(81) = -0.34$, $p = 0.002$. 
Appendix A

Auckland Individualism and Collectivism Scale

Responses are given on a six-point Likert Scale of “How often does this apply to me?” ranging from never or almost never to always.

1. I discuss job or study-related problems with my parents.
2. I consult my family before making important decisions.
3. Before taking a major trip, I consult with most members of my family.
4. It is important to consult close friends and get their ideas before making a decision.
5. Even when I strongly disagree with my group members, I avoid an argument.
6. I hate to disagree with others in my group.
7. It is important to make a good impression on one’s manager.
8. In interacting with superiors, I am always polite.
9. It is important to consider the needs of those who work above me.
10. I sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group.
11. I reveal personal things about myself.
12. I have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments.
13. I like to live lose to my good friends.
14. To me, pleasure is spending time with my superiors.
15. To me, pleasure is spending time with others.
16. I help acquaintances, even if it is inconvenient.
17. I define myself as a competitive person.
18. I enjoy working in situations involving competitions with others.
19. Without competition, it is not possible to have a good society.
20. Competition is the law of nature.
21. I consider my self as a unique person separate from others.
22. I enjoy being unique and different from others.
23. I see my self as “my own person.”
24. I take responsibility for my own actions.
25. It is important for me to act as an independent person.
26. Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.
27. I consult with my superiors on work-related matters.
28. I prefer to be self-reliant rather than depend on others.
29. It is my duty to take care of my family, even when I have to sacrifice what I want.
30. When faced with a difficult personal problem, it is better to decide for myself, than follow the advice of others.
Appendix B

Cheating Perception Scales

Responses were given on a five point Likert Scale of “Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the given statements about the scene.” The scale ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

- This student is a good student. (1-5)
- This student is a cheater. (1-5)
- This student was correct to do it. (1-5)
- The student is not justified to do this. (1-5)

Additionally, responses were given to “Is this action a violation of academic standards?” with It is a major violation, It is a minor violation, It is not a violation.
Appendix C

Vignette Examples

Fabrication of Data

Anabella was assigned to write an essay for a class, but she’s worried she will not have time for her other homework if she works on this essay. Instead, she looked online and bought an essay from a website and turned it in to her instructor.

Fabrication of Data

Hiro is doing an experiment but is not finding the results he wanted to. He makes up data to add to the study results to help the study make sense.
Collusion

Chuck is taking a test. He had to work at his job a lot last week and did not study for the test, so he looks at another student’s test to see her answer.

Non-cheating Behavior

Mihir is teaching his classmates about a class subject, but they do not seem to understand. He makes up a false example to help them understand.